

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

From: Plaintiff/Jerome Hamilton  
Appellant/Pro Se.  
320 East Fifth Street  
Apt.#609  
Wilmington, Delaware.19801

Dated: March 25,2005

TO:

MR. JOHN W. SHAW,ESQUIRE  
YOUNG,CONAWAY,STARGATT & TAYLOR,LLP  
LAW OFFICES  
THE BRANDYWINE BUILDING  
1000 WEST STREET, 17th, Floor.  
WILMINGTON,DELAWARE.19801

Re: Hamilton v. Leavy, et al.  
Civil Action No.94-336-KAJ\*

FILED  
CLERK U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF DELAWARE  
2005 MAR 29 AM 11:18

Dear Mr. Shaw,Esquire:

I am writing in follow-up with more information details why - and the reason's Mr.John W. Shaw,Esquire and the law firm of Young,Conaway,- Stargatt, & Taylor,LLP/The Brandywine Building/1000 West Street, 17th, Floor Wilmington,Delaware.19801. "Should immediately cease there representation - of Plaintiff/Appellant"/Pro Se. Now please read the below plaintiff/appella- -nt/Pro Se, basis and issue's and grounds for purpose of future reference - in above-captioned on appeal arguments.

(1.) I, Plaintiff/Appellant/Jerome Hamilton, Pro Se, hereby de- -clares under penalty of perjury state that: Mr. John W. Shaw,Esquire,deny- plaintiff, a fair jury trial by their mis-representation actions and conduct on March 17,2005 by not objecting or raised a objections on plaintiff behalf when Judge Jordan, denied the jury's and the foreman jury response and the- their request to see the date of document snitch for first time in front of inmates on IE/Pod. This document that the jury's wanted to examine before it make their jury verdict, was the following material evidence that should have been part of plaintiff or was it part of/plaintiff record exhibits documents. The document grievance reprimand where plaintiff was call a snitch by the - correctional officer Simpson. See:(Deposition Exhibit-Martino/2 and 3). Mr.- -Shaw,Esquire, have failed to act on plaintiff behalf at crucial stages in - above-captioned case litigation reasonably that action deprive plaintiff a - - fair jury trial verdict.

(2). Plaintiff/Jerome Hamilton, Pro Se, hereby declares under penalty of perjury states the following. That Mr. John W. Shaw, Esquire, and their firm should immediately cease their representation on their own interest of fairness under (Delaware Lawyers Rules of Professional Conduct, Under Rule 1.16), Permits a lawyers to cease representation of their client where "good cause for withdrawal exist. Plaintiff/Hamilton, Pro Se, is raising now and on appeal for future reference, concerning Mr. Shaw, Esquire, never raise any objections on record any of side bars conference with defendants attorneys, Judge Jordan, and Mr. Shaw, Esquire. But the plaintiff, and the jury's never heard a word they was discussing about the evidence's of plaintiff case this incident occurred on March 14, thru 17, 2005 jury trial.

(3). Plaintiff/Jerome Hamilton, Pro Se, want Mr. Shaw, Esquire, to explain in detail what was you the Judge Jordan, and the defendant's attorneys was discussing at the many side bar conference that couldn't be heard by plaintiff or members of jury on March 14, thru 17, 2005. Mr. John W. Shaw, Esquire, please explain on this record what was your objections on the plaintiff behalf dealing with side bar discussion's about what Mr. Shaw, Esquire. Plaintiff/Hamilton, Pro Se, believe that Mr. John W. Shaw, Esquire, have violate 10 Del. Code. & 1907. Oath of attorneys-at-law. Reause Plaintiff, can SHOW from record that Mr. Shaw, Esquire, was ineffective which cause break-down in attorney and client relationship, and as result plaintiff was a fair or was denied fair jury trial on March 14, thru 17, 2005.

(4). Plaintiff/Jerome Hamilton/Pro Se, hereby Declares under penalty of perjury states the following: That Mr. John W. Shaw, Esquire, and their firm Young, Conaway, Stargatt & Taylor, LLP, THE BRANDYWINE BUILDING, -17th, Floor. 1000 West Street, Wilmington, Delaware. 19801/ Should immediately cease their representation on their own interest of fairness under (Delaware-Lawyers Rules of Professional Conduct Under Rule (1)(16), permits a lawyers to cease representation where conflict of interest by the attorney neglect of his duties to protect his client interest at all times. Plaintiff/Hamilton, want to raised on appeal will be that Mr. Shaw, Esquire, had lease around about fourteen side bar conference's with Judge Jordan, defendant's Attorneys, and you Mr. Shaw, Esquire, on March 14, thru 17, 2005. Mr. Shaw, Esquire, why you couldn't explain to plaintiff what evidence was being discuss and why???

(5). Plaintiff/Jerome Hamilton/Pro Se, hereby declares for future reference under penalty of perjury states the following: Mr. Shaw, Esquire, please explain for record why didn't plaintiff, or juries know why we you reveal what the court and defendants attorneys talking about at the side-bar discussion on March 14, 15, 16, and 17, 2005. And their wasn't knew objections raised on plaintiff behalf why. Plaintiff/Hamilton/Pro Se, and the juries should have heard everything that court/Judge Jordan, defendant's attorneys and Mr. Shaw, Esquire, what was discuss at side bar conference just among them on March 14, 15, 16, and 17, 2005 jury trial. That statement right there can Mr. Shaw, Esquire, should want to withdrawal from this case himself because of his unprofessional misconduct of officer of the court.

(6). Plaintiff/Jerome Hamilton/Pro Se, hereby declares for future reference's raised grounds for appeal purpose's under penalty of perjury states for record, following: Mr. Shaw, Esquire, failure to act on the plaintiff behalf, concerning not calling witness's for the plaintiff for trial by jury on March 14, 2005. These witness's could give evidence about they heard a correctional officer Simpson, call plaintiff a snitch in front about 25 other inmates on Pod 1E Poplution. It is very important to acknowledge for record, on March 17, 2005 jury trial/. The jury's request the court that they wanted to or would like to know the date of reprimand the correctional officer Simpson, who called plaintiff/Hamilton a snitch. See: (ATTACHED EXHIBIT "A"). --- Mr. Shaw, Esquire, did you raised a objection when Judge Jordan, denied the jury's to see plaintiff evidence records. See: (Deposition Exhibit-Martino/2 and 3). Mr. John W. Shaw, Esquire, you cause me of receiving a fair jury trial on March 14, 2005, because you never raised any objections on plaintiff behalf about to preserved the reason for objections for appellate jurisdiction review.

(7). Plaintiff/Jerome Hamilton/Pro Se, hereby declares for future reference's raised grounds for appellate jurisdiction review under penalty of perjury for record following: PLAINTIFF/Hamilton, explain or produce for record that Mr. Shaw, Esquire, on March 14, thru 17, 2005, never object to the side bars conference's with Judge Jordan, Defendant's Attorneys, and also Mr. Shaw, and plaintiff along with jury's never heard what was their discussing about. Mr. Shaw, Esquire, why not after every side bar discussion that you come out of that side bar discussion, and put on the record the plaintiff objections on his behalf. And that would have preserved plaintiff raised issue's and grounds for appellate jurisdiction review. Mr. Shaw, Esquire, your misrepresentation from the start of discovery until jury trial on March 14, 2005. And as result of Mr. Shaw, Esquire, failure to act on the behalf/of plaintiff, I was denied a fair jury trial by your mis-conduct action toward plaintiff.

(8). Mr. Shaw, Esquire, what was position on March 14, 2005 jury trial when you told Plaintiff/Hamilton, about all the evidence's which wasn't part of plaintiff/record in case for review by the jury's. Please explain more clear now what your position at that time.

(9). Plaintiff/Jerome Hamilton/Pro Se, hereby declares for future reference's raised grounds for appellate jurisdiction review under penalty of perjury for record following: Mr. John W. Shaw, Esquire, what was your position when you heard that the jury's requested from the to see from plaintiff-on/documents and records where the correctional officer Simpson got reprimand by Warden/and/Deputy Warden Martino. See: (ATTACHED EXHIBIT-A). This incident did occurred on March 17, 2005 jury trial. Mr. Shaw, Esquire, why you didn't request to court on plaintiff behalf, to allow the jury's members to review and examine the date of the reprimand the correctional officer Simpson, called Hamilton a snitch. The Mr. Shaw, Esquire, why was my jury not allow to see evidence where snitch incident happen. See: (Deposition Exhibit-Martino/2 and 3).

(10). Plaintiff/Jerome Hamilton/Pro Se, hereby declares for future reference's raised grounds for appellate jurisdiction review under penalty of perjury for record states: Mr. John W. Shaw, Esquire, who was the - name of jury member foreman, that request the court that wanted to see the - plaintiff/evidence would like to know the date of the reprimand the where the correctional officer Simpson called Hamilton a "snitch"? This incident did occurred on March 17, 2005 A.M. 11:24. See: (ATTACHED EXHIBIT-"A").

Dated: March 25, 2005.

Respectfully Submitted  
*Jerome Hamilton, a.k.a. Cheikh Elohim*  
Plaintiff/Jerome Hamilton, a.k.a.,  
Cheikh A. Elohim  
320 East Fifth Street/Apt.#609  
Wilmington, Delaware. 19801

Sworn to and Subscribed before me, this 29th day  
of March, 2005.

CC:

pLAINTIFF/Jerome Hamilton  
Clerk of the Court  
Mr. Peter T. Dalleo

*Shayla Russell*  
*Notary*

(i) Would like to know the date of the  
Keprum and ~~the~~ the CO called Hamilton  
a "snitch"?

Exhibit- A

FILED  
CLERK U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF DELAWARE  
2005 MAR 17 AM 11:24